

Montagna et al., 10/696342

Amdt., p. 14

## FURTHER REMARKS

As may apply to the present claims, the rejection of claims 1-25 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, is respectfully traversed. No claim contains subject matter not described in the supporting specification in such a way as to convey to any person skilled in the pertinent art that the inventors, at the time of filing of the application, had possession of the claimed invention. The term, "cam-follower bearing," is well known in the art. See, e.g., U.S. patent Nos. 4,061,246 (column 2, lines 55-53, and the front page figure); and 4,601,160 (column 2, lines 65-67, and FIG. 5A) -- copies of which are submitted herewith. Moreover, various dependent claims require this to include needle bearings. The term, "French F-channel," which should be read more fully as, "inverted French F-channel," is described in the specification in words and by reference to the drawings, and is recognized in the art. See, e.g., U.S. patent No. Des. 478,858 -- a copy of which is also submitted herewith. Moreover, the pertinent base claims incorporate specific language to more particularly point out and distinctly claim what is intended by the term.

As may apply to the present claims, the rejection of claims 1-25 under Sec. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, is respectfully traversed. The claims have been amended to define the term, "inverted French F-channel"; to more particularly point out which rail is of concern, as in claim 3; to provide proper basis for "parallel rails," as in claim 4; to delete the term, "subcombination," as in claim 4; eliminate the words, "pin or," with respect to the remaining term, "needle bearings"; and avoid combination subject matter as had been present in claims 17-22. As will be appreciated from the above, the term, "cam-follower bearing," is well known and definite to the skilled artisan.

The written descriptive portion of the specification has been formally amended to insure that the word, "needle," is present in the paragraph kindly noted by the Examiner. The abstract has been amended to render it to be less than 150 words.

As may apply to the present claims, the rejection of claims 1-4, 11-22, 26-28 under 35 USC 102(b) over Darbishire, US 6328364, is respectfully traversed. There is no written description or drawing in that patent which describes the inverted French F-channel, to include its stabilizing base foot, as was later admitted on page 5 of the outstanding action; which describes the inverted U-channel, to include its depending rail-aligning portion, which extends downwardly substantially the same distance as does its bearing-mounting portion; nor which describes the cam-follower bearing -- as required in base claim 1 and those claims dependent on it. Nor is there a disclosure of a movable mounting frame with a support member for supporting a slide-in/out accessory that can slide in and slide out relative to the movable mounting frame as required further in claim 15 or otherwise found in claim 26, much less the accessory itself as in claims 16 and 27, which is a drawer as in claim 28.

Montagna et al., 10/696342

Amdt., p. 15

Each claim was commonly owned at the time of invention.

As may apply to the present claims, the rejection of claims 5-10, 23-25 under 35 USC 103(a) over Darbshire in view of Tognetti, US 5649731, is respectfully traversed. The proposed combination neither teaches nor suggests the detailed inverted French F-channel with its feet, tracks, rollers and other features especially arranged in a system as claimed in the base claims 1 and 23 nor the peculiarly advantageous arrangements of various features to include rollers as further set forth in claims 5-8, 24 and 25, nor the unheard of in the art 3000-pound load capacity as required in present claims 9 and 10. In fact, if Tognetti can be properly applied at all, it teaches away from the present arrangements by teaching to an opposing foot arrangement that is suitable only in a simple rail over which a pulley-style roller is rolled. That rail has no attached roller. The disclosures of Darbshire and Tognetti are so different, in fact, as to teach away from the present claimed invention. No specific direction is given. Rather, at best, any combined disclosure provides for ambiguity as to what direction to go and which features to select.

As may apply to the present claims, the rejection of claims 26 and 29 under 35 USC 103(a) over Darbshire in view of Clark et al., US 5803523, is respectfully traversed. The proposed combination neither teaches nor suggests the support member for supporting a slide-in/out accessory in a movable mounting frame for a pull out drawer system, which can slide in and slide out relative to the movable mounting frame. Clark et al. has no pull out drawer system. Nor nor does that system slide in or out truly relative to a movable mounting frame for the pull out drawer system. Clark et al. shows a telescoping system that moves relative to a stationary mounting frame. The system itself may form a ramp, but there is no ramp that can be separated from yet attachable to the movable frame, as in claim 29. Darbshire discloses no accessory to a movable mounting frame that can slide in and slide out relative to the movable mounting frame. In fact, if Clark et al. can be properly applied at all, it teaches away from the present pull out drawer system arrangements by teaching to a telescoping ramp system for application to a tailgate of a pickup truck. The disclosures of Darbshire and Clark et al. are so different, in fact, as to teach away from the present claimed invention. No specific direction is given. Rather, at best, any combined disclosure provides for ambiguity as to what direction to go and which features to select.

Please, therefore, withdraw the objection and rejections.

The Examiner was correct to have not applied Gehman et al., US 6007142.

New claim 30 requires a movable frame as of claim 27, wherein the slide-in/slide-out accessory includes both a drawer and a ramp, and at least one of the drawer and the ramp has a length substantially greater than its width and slides in and slides out

Montagna et al., 10/696342

Amdt., p. 16

in a direction of its length. New claim 31 requires a movable frame as of claim 27, which is for a cargo area of a vehicle or trailer, and is connected to a stationary frame as part of the pull out drawer system. New claim 32 requires a movable frame as of claim 31, which further includes a load-bearing surface mounted on top of the movable frame so that the load-bearing surface remains fixed in relation to the movable frame. No such embodiment is found in the art of record, to include that of Darbshire, Tognetti, and Clark et al., nor Gehman et al.

Please indicate Examiner approval of the formal drawings.


The present application is in condition for allowance. Yet, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to discuss the case, or to seek authorization for an Examiner's amendment.

The Examiner's assistance in formulating claims he would deem allowable is requested if this amendment falls short in his eyes.

A Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully,

Dated: December 2, 2004 A.D.

  
Christopher John Rudy  
PTO Registration No. 31,873  
209 Huron Avenue, Suite 8  
Port Huron, Michigan 48060  
Telephone (810) 982-4221

Encls: Cited art + PTO/SB/D8A